



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

of this request had nothing else in view than to see the holy supper of the Lord administered according to the command of Jesus Christ, and according to the custom of the Church for many ages. But, notwithstanding that, these very reverend fathers were most obstinate in their refusal. Do you know why? Because Rome had approved of communion under one kind only, and they wished to make it appear that that Church was infallible.

Eustachio.—This seems impossible; but at all events the Council of Trent must have decreed something concerning the marriage of the clergy. It must, at least, have given some satisfaction to those who demanded that they should be left at liberty to marry or not as they pleased.

Salviano.—In the 24th Sess. (which was the eighth under Pius IV.), in the 9th canon, the fathers of the Council of Trent thus decreed—"If any one shall say that clerks constituted in sacred orders or regulars who have solemnly professed chastity, are able to contract marriage, and that, being contracted, it is valid, the ecclesiastical law or vow notwithstanding, &c., let him be anathema." Among the canons which were made in that same session, there is one which excommunicates all those who shall say that the Church has not power to dispense with the impediments of contracting marriage in some of the prohibited degrees (Can. 3). Now what is this Church except it be the pope, who permits a man to marry his sister-in-law? Is it the church? No; the Church has the name of this power, but the pope possesses it in fact. Pius IV., who was the last ruler of the council, and author of these canons, gave Philip II. permission to marry his own sister. St. John the Baptist said to Herod, "It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother's wife" (St. Matthew, xiv. 4.); but if that incestuous union was condemned by St. John, I suppose it might, for all that, by a particular dispensation, be allowed by the pope, for what is the Baptist himself when compared with his Holiness? A Roman council, moreover (celebrated under Gregory III.), thunders forth its interdicts, in the 5th canon, against the incestuous. It says—"If any one shall take in marriage his brother's wife, let him be anathema;" and all the fathers cried out three times "let him be anathema." But the Council of Trent (Sess. 24th, Canon 12), by adjudging every marriage case to the clergy, takes away the impediment—"If any one shall say that matrimonial causes do not concern ecclesiastical judges, let him be anathema." We must be very blind, if we do not see that this is a hurt to society and to secular government. In ancient times the sovereigns made the laws about matrimony, and St. Augustine (de civit. Dei lib., 15, cap. 16), and St. Ambrose (epist. 66), are our witnesses that Theodosius Cæsar was one of those who did so.

(To be Continued)

THE OLD IRISH CLERGY—No. III.

(Continued from page 35.)

The exertions of the Church of Rome to strengthen her system of discipline, by the prohibition of marriage among the clergy, at the close of the eleventh and commencement of the twelfth centuries, are matters with which students of church history are familiar. Less generally known to them, perhaps, is the (however, not less certain) fact, that the first propagation in Ireland of the influence in support of which such efforts were made, was owing to the settlement of the Danish invaders in the country; one of whom, Gille, educated at the Norman abbey of Bec, and afterwards bishop of the Danes of Limerick, brought over with him, from France, those predilections for the whole system of the Church of Rome which he had there imbibed; and his activity and zeal being such as to gain him, in the course of time, the appointment of *first Pope's legate for Ireland*, his exertions in that capacity appear to have been the instrument, more than any other, of securing for the principle and system of Papal supremacy a firm foundation in this island.

Kellach, or Kelly (called also Celsus), successor of St. Patrick, whose name occurs at A.D. 1105, &c., above, was an earnest adopter of the views propagated by Gille, as was in a still higher degree the famous Malachy, or Melmogue, whom he nominated as his successor to the primacy: this act, although not a very canonical one, indicating sufficiently Kellach's adoption of the new system, which led him thus to exert himself, in defiance of all rights claimed by other members of his family, to alienate from them the succession to the primacy, to which their hereditary title had been through many generations so firmly established. But his efforts to break this national custom could not be expected to be let pass without violent opposition.

Malachy, on his way to Rome, in A.D. 1139, and again when returning to Ireland on that occasion, and once more, just before his death, in A.D. 1148, paid three successive visits to the great St. Bernard, at Clairvaux, which gave the latter an opportunity of inquiring with great interest into the state of the Irish Church, and learning from his visitor much concerning her circumstances that was curious and worthy of note, especially to one educated under so different a system as that under which Bernard had been brought up. Among other things, Malachy gave him a particular account of the hereditary succession which had so long been regulating the appointments to the primacy in Ireland, and of the efforts at length made to break it,

in which he was himself so much interested. But in giving this recital Malachy seems to have confined his information to the case of Armagh, either not mentioning at all that this mode of succession was common and generally prevalent in Ireland, or else, perhaps, describing it as carried out in Armagh in an exclusive way, which led to abuses not so much to be observed elsewhere. This appears from the circumstance that St. Bernard, in his *Life of Malachy*, attacks with much fury the Armagh family succession, but makes no allusion to the operation of the same system in other places in Ireland. With regard to the former, his observations are to the following effect:—

"A most atrocious practice had been established, by the diabolical ambition of certain people of noble rank, that the holy see [i.e., of Armagh] should be obtained by hereditary succession; for they would allow none to be bishops there save such as were of their own tribe and family. Nor was it for any short period that this execrable succession had been going on; some fifteen generations having already been exhausted in such villainy. And so firmly had this wicked and adulterous generation established their unholy right (or wrong, rather, deserving to be punished by the worst death), that although there were at times no clergymen to be found of their blood, yet bishops they never were without. In fine, there had already been before Celsus, eight persons, who were married and without orders, yet still men of education. Hence arose throughout Ireland all that relaxation of Church discipline, powerlessness of censures, and annihilation of religion aforesaid."

Celsus, therefore (or Kellach), anxious, according to St. Bernard, to remedy these evils, nominated Malachy for his successor; who, however, did not immediately nor easily obtain the office. "For, lo, of the wicked race, another, named Murtoth, seizes on the post, who for five years, by the aid of the secular power, settled himself on the Church, not a bishop, but a tyrant." And his "presumption," Bernard says, maintained this condition of "ecclesiastical adultery" (a Church with two bishops appearing to him like a wife with two husbands) for three years (see A.D. 1129, 1132, above); after which Malachy secured in part the "successorship of Patrick," in spite of the "numbers, power, and ambition of that noble family who had now for about 200 years kept possession of the sanctuary of God." He could only, however, act in the office *through the country*, being excluded from appearing in Armagh by the power of his adversary, Murtoth, so long as he survived.

Murtoth dying A.D. 1134, "one Niall" (Nigellus—i.e., blackish), says St. Bernard, "yea, a thorough black, seized upon the see. For Murtoth, while yet alive, had made provision to this effect, against his own soul, that, going out of the world to be damned, he might have for heir one in whom he could still persist in adding to his works of damnation; for this latter, too, was of that damned race, a kinsman of Murtoth's."

What a strange contrast between the Irish obit of Murtoth, as above given from the *Four Masters*, at A.D. 1134, and the obit of the same individual in St. Bernard's *Latin Life of Malachy*. According to one, "Murtoth, Successor of St. Patrick, died penitent—yea, triumphant;" according to the other, "Murtoth—no bishop, but a tyrant, an ecclesiastical adulterer—went from this world to be damned, yet still to live in an heir, provided for the purpose of adding to his deeds of damnation!" Why this difference? It arises, simply, dear reader, from the different feelings of the parties telling the same story in their different ways—it being told, in the first case, by men who looked at the matter simply in an old Irish and national point of view; in the other case, by one who viewed it as a zealous member of the Church of Rome at then existing, and seeking to establish her influence in Ireland.

Our next paper will, we hope, throw some further light on the matter so far elucidated in the present one.

R. K.

HOW FAR THE REFORMATION IS AFFECTED BY THE CHARACTERS AND MOTIVES OF THE REFORMERS.

It has been usual with Roman Catholic controversialists, since the time of the Reformation, to attempt to throw discredit on the Reformation itself by vilifying the characters of the principal persons who were engaged in bringing it about. Luther, Calvin, Zuinglius, Cranmer, and Knox have been charged with almost every crime that has disgraced the most infamous of men; and the vocabulary of malignant abuse has been exhausted to supply epithets sufficiently vile for such pestilent disturbers of the established order of things. These charges, it is needless to tell any one who knows anything whatever about the subject, have been met and refuted, over and over again. The most irrefragable evidence has been adduced, not from friends of the reforming party, but from impartial historians, and even from *enemies*, showing that the charges in question are either pure inventions, or such gross misrepresentations of facts as to be destitute of any force as proofs. Yet these charges still continue to be brought forward. Like the giant in the fable, each successive overthrow only seems to lend them new life and vigour. Thus, in a recent Roman Catholic Catechism,*

which, it appears, enjoys an extensive circulation, the very first page that we open contains a choice selection of the old stories about Luther, by which it was attempted to drag him down to the level of the heretics, the magicians, and unnatural monsters who, it is admitted by Baronius and Bellarmine, found means to seat themselves, from time to time, in the chair of St. Peter. In this Catechism, we ourselves soon recognised all our old acquaintances—the stock stories which we had occasion, some time since, to track through many a dusty folio, until we left them overwhelmed, as we thought, by a weight of opposing evidence which no wise Romanist would now venture to resist. It was, therefore, not without some surprise that we found them all furnished up anew, and marshalled in imposing array, just as if they had never before been challenged and refuted. At first, we felt inclined to be somewhat provoked at this cool ignoring of all that had been said and written upon the subject; but, upon second thoughts, we saw reason to change our mind, and rather to rejoice that these ancient calumnies were again raked up and paraded with such affected triumph. In matters of every-day life, when two rival causes are submitted to our judgment it is usually regarded as a presumption in favour of one of them, when its opponents, instead of assailing it with legitimate arguments, endeavour to raise a prejudice against it by abusing its advocates, and blackening their characters; and we are, on the other hand, irresistibly led to suspect that there must be something radically unsound in the cause of those who indulge in such personalities, and seek to divert attention from the facts and reason of the case to discussions either entirely irrelevant, or, at least, of very secondary importance. We recognise, at once, the well-known tactics of unscrupulous advocates, and we conclude that a cause which needs such advocacy, must be inherently weak and bad. This, we think, is the result to which, in ordinary disputes, every impartial and sensible looker-on is inevitably led. And the presumption becomes a certainty, when it further appears that the individuals so attacked have already satisfactorily vindicated their characters from the aspersions cast upon them, and that the charges, so pertinaciously insisted on, are nothing better than exploded calumnies. Unfair dealing of this kind, at all times reprehensible and offensive, becomes doubly so in matters of religion. Every right-minded man feels instinctively that the sacredness of the subject ought to protect it from the pollution of such base and dishonourable devices. And yet, unfortunately, it is too true that the proverbial bitterness of religious strife has nowhere more frequently displayed itself than in this very mode of procedure. When the doctrines of the Reformation proved too stubborn to be refuted by argument, the characters of the Reformers were assailed by every vile calumny which the malignity of defeated controversialists and the wrath of an offended hierarchy, conscious that their system had received a fatal wound, could devise. These accusations were, as we have said before, met and answered as soon as they were made. But they form too inviting a topic for popular declamation to be given up merely because they are groundless. Accordingly, Mr. Keenan and other controversialists of the same stamp gloat over them with manifest delight, and retail them for the benefit of those who are ignorant enough to believe that they are all unquestioned facts.

Nor is this the only unfairness of which inquiring Roman Catholics, no less than Protestants, have to complain in this matter. A moment's reflection will show that besides the suspicious charges which are sought to be palmed upon the ignorant as established facts, there is also a gross fallacy at the bottom of the argument deduced from them. The argument is the following:—The Reformers were bad men; therefore the Reformation must be a bad thing, and its doctrines must be false. No reasonable man requires to be told that this conclusion is not necessarily true, even admitting the assumed fact that the authors of the Reformation were worthless men, influenced by selfish and bad motives. Let us just apply the same argument to one or two other cases in which party bias does not interfere to warp our judgments. The Barons of England, in the time of King John, were licentious, lawless, and selfish men; therefore, *Magna Charta* is worthless. The Crusaders were, for the most part, greedy and unprincipled adventurers; therefore, the religion of which they were the champions—viz., Christianity—is false; and the faith against which they fought—viz., Mahometanism—is true. Every one, including, probably, Mr. Keenan himself, would at once exclaim that this reasoning is invalid. And yet, the argument of Roman Catholics against the Reformation and in favour of their own system, from the supposed bad characters of the promoters of the former, is, in principle, not one whit more sound.

We might let the matter rest here, as even the general answer just given is abundantly sufficient for the vindication both of the Reformers and the Reformation. We are not, however, disposed to stop at this point, but we shall proceed to examine the question more in detail; and we undertake to show not only that the assumed facts are false, and that the argument founded upon them is nugatory; but that, if it be admitted to be valid, it puts into Protestant hands a weapon which may be wielded with the most deadly effect against the very system which it was framed to uphold—viz., the system of the Papacy.

We have then two distinct assertions to deal with—first, that the principal Reformers were selfish, worthless, and wicked men; and, secondly, that the fact of their being

* "Controversial Catechism," by Rev. S. Keenan. Edinb., 1851.

so necessarily vitiate everything which proceeded from them. We will discuss the second point first, because it is the one shown that such an inference is untenable or proves too much, the cause of the Reformation, about which we are more concerned than about the characters of its promoters, remains unshaken, whatever may be said or thought of the motives or acts of the Reformers.

Now, in the first place, it is most important to bear in mind that Luther and the rest of the Reformers did not seek to set up a system of their own devising in opposition to that of Rome. They objected to certain received dogmas and practices that they were unscriptural and opposed to the teaching and usages of the best ages of the Church. Their professed design was to free the existing Church from the corruptions which had gradually overspread it in the lapse of ages, and to bring it back to the simplicity and purity of primitive times. This design they sought to effect by directing men's attention to Holy Scripture, as the authentic record of the Divine will, and asking them to judge for themselves whether the doctrines and practices against which they protested were or were not conformable to the letter or spirit of the Gospel. No matter, then, what their motives or what their private characters may have been, such was the professed object of the Reformers, and such were the means which they employed to compass it. To the written Word of God, as the sole ultimate standard of truth, and to the teaching of the primitive Church, embodied in the Creeds, the Reformers ever appealed, utterly rejecting the notion that they intended, like the heretics and schismatics of old, to call in question those doctrines for which clear Scriptural warrant could be produced, or those institutions and rites which could be shown to have been established by sufficient ecclesiastical authority and not to be contrary to Holy Scripture.

Against such a design, prosecuted by such means, it is utterly idle to object that its promoters were influenced by base and unworthy motives. Admitting, for argument's sake, that the existence of such motives is compatible with the pursuit of such an end, every one sees that the excellence of the latter is not compromised by contact with the former. It is unnecessary to appeal to Scripture in support of so self-evident a proposition. If Scripture proof were wanting, it exists in abundance. Thus, our Blessed Lord says to His disciples and the multitude, "The Scribes and the Pharisees have sitten on the chair of Moses. All things, therefore, whatsoever they shall say to you, observe and do; but according to their works do ye not: for they say and do not"—Matt. xxiii. 2, 3. Here a broad line of distinction is drawn between the doctrine taught, and the teachers of it. If the former be *Scriptural*, it is to be received with all attention and reverence, even though the life and conversation of the teachers may be in direct opposition to what they inculcate. And, in fact, it is, as every one knows, a fundamental tenet of the Roman Catholic, as well as of the Protestant Church, that the efficacy of the Sacraments is not impaired by the unworthiness of those who administer them. Again, St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Philippians, alludes to certain persons who were then preaching Christ in opposition to himself, and under the influence of strife and envy; but so far is he from deprecating such preaching, or warning his Philippian converts to beware of teaching coming from such a source, as necessarily dangerous and false, that, on the contrary, he rejoices at it. His words are as follow—"Some, indeed, even out of envy and contention; but some also for good will, preach Christ: some out of charity, knowing that I am set for the defence of the Gospel. And some out of contention preach Christ, not sincerely; supposing that they raise affliction to my bands. But what then? So that by all means, whether by occasion or by truth, Christ be preached; in this also I rejoice, yea, and will rejoice"—Phil. i. 13, &c. If St. Paul had reasoned—with reverence be it spoken—as Mr. Keenan and those who agree with him do, he must have denounced the doctrine of such teachers as necessarily heretical and dangerous. They taught out of contention and strife and envy (the very motives attributed to the Reformers); and yet the apostle rejoiced that even from such motives Christ was preached. The doctrine he approved, while he condemned the unworthy motives of those who inculcated it.

But, in truth, such reasoning as that of Mr. Keenan is based on principles which involve an utter disregard of all that we learn from the Bible and from the course of God's natural providence, relative to the means which He employs in order to bring about His purposes. We need not now dwell on the numberless examples, furnished by the social and political history of the world, of means apparently most inadequate to, or even positively unfitted for, the accomplishment of certain ends, yet being the very means by which those ends were attained. We prefer to notice one or two of the numerous cases recorded in the Bible, which illustrate the great truth, that His ways are not our ways, nor His thoughts our thoughts.

Who would have believed, beforehand, that a hard-hearted and unfeeling tyrant would be selected as the means of displaying Jehovah's power and glory to all the earth? And yet, so it was. God himself says to Pharaoh—"Therefore have I raised thee, that I may show my power in thee, and my name may be spoken of throughout all the earth."—Exod. ix. 16, comp. Rom. 9, 17. Who would have conjectured, before the fact, that a greedy

soothsayer—perhaps an enchanter—would have been chosen as the person to bless the hosts of the living God? Yet so it was. The evil purposes of Balaam were overruled by Divine appointment, so that his employer, Balak, was forced to exclaim in the bitterness of disappointed wrath—"I called thee to curse my enemies, and thou, on the contrary, hast blessed them three times."—Numbers xxiv. 10.

Let us now consider, for a moment, whether the New Testament history lends any support to Mr. Keenan's principle, that we are competent judges beforehand of the means by which God may be expected to effect His ends. We say Mr. Keenan's principle, because his argument against the Reformation, from the supposed unworthiness of the reformers, ultimately resolves itself into the position just stated. Let us then take as the most obvious tests of the correctness of his reasoning, the cases of our Blessed Lord and His disciples. Is anything more opposed to the received notions of the adaptation of means to ends, than the fact that the author of a new religion, destined to become co-extensive with the limits of the world, should have appeared among a people proverbially despised, and separated by civil and religious institutions from all the rest of the world? And yet the Redeemer was a despised Jew. Nay, more, he was a poor Galilean, despised even by the Jews themselves. Accordingly, his countrymen rejected him (and, on Mr. Keenan's principles, very naturally) on the ground—"Can any good thing come out of Galilee?" Dr. Newman—of whom, as a convert, the Church of Rome is so proud—will suggest to Mr. Keenan another Scriptural fact, connected with the Messiah, still more opposed to antecedent probability—"Is it not," says Dr. Newman, "very strange, and very significant, that our Lord and Saviour, the immaculate Lamb of God, should be descended not only from virtuous Ruth, the *Moabitess*, but also from *incestuous Tamar*?" We earnestly commend this "significant" fact to the attention of Mr. Keenan, and those who argue as he does.

And if we pass on from our Lord to his Apostles, we find a further illustration of the fact that the means employed by Divine Wisdom, are often antecedently improbable. What more unlikely than that a few ignorant Galilean fishermen should have been commissioned to revolutionize the world by the preaching of the religion of one who had been just condemned to the most ignominious of deaths? Might not any Jew or heathen have fairly argued, on the principles of Mr. Keenan—"It is utterly impossible that an all-wise and all-powerful Being should intend to accomplish a vast religious revolution by such means as these?" The Jew might add, still reasoning as Mr. Keenan does—"If Jehovah designed to effect a reformation of the Mosaic law, he would, doubtless, employ as His instruments the authorized heads and teachers of the established religion, the divinely-instituted priesthood, and the great ecclesiastical Council of the nation, presided over by the High Priest. An irregular movement, such as you Peter, James, John, and the rest of you, are agitating, must be the result of delusion or of fraud." Such would be the natural inference, on the principles adopted by Mr. Keenan. But hear what God himself says, speaking by his inspired Apostle, St. Paul—"But the foolish things of the world hath God chosen, that he may confound the wise; and the weak things of the world hath God chosen, that he may confound the strong. And the base things of the world, and the things that are contemptible hath God chosen; and things that are not, that he might bring to nought things that are; that no flesh should glory in his sight."—1 Cor. i. 27, &c.

And this suggests a word, in conclusion, regarding the case of the Apostle Paul himself. What more unlikely beforehand, than that the mightiest champion of the Christian faith, the great Apostle of the Gentiles, should have been chosen from among that sect which was noted at once for the bitterest animosity against the religion of Jesus, and the most bigoted attachment to Judaism? And yet, so it was. Saul, of Tarsus, "a strict Pharisee, a blasphemer, a persecutor, and contumelious" (1 Tim. i. 13), was selected "as a vessel of election to carry Christ's name before the Gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel."—Acts ix. 15.

It is, we trust, unnecessary to guard ourselves against the misconception that, in anything that has just been said, we intend to institute a comparison between the characters of the Reformers on the one hand, and those of our Lord and His apostles on the other. We utterly disclaim any such intention. Our object has been, to show the unsoundness of the principles in Mr. Keenan's argument against the doctrines of the Reformation, derived from the seeming unfitness of the means then made use of to effect an end really designed by God. And if the facts and considerations just adduced be carefully weighed, they must, unless we are greatly mistaken, cause any reasonable man to pause before he assents to principles opposed to what we learn from God's dealings in Providence as well as in Revelation.

In our next number we propose to show how dangerous a weapon this argument of Mr. Keenan's (admitted to be valid) puts into our hands against the doctrines and practices of the Church of Rome itself.

RESULTS OF INTOLERANCE—REVOCATION OF THE EDICT OF NANTES.

In a former number of this publication we called the attention of our readers to the intolerance of the Roman Catholic system in all former periods of her history, and we pointed out that the boasted unity of that Church was really founded upon the extermination of all its opponents. The example we then brought forward as illustrating the application of their system and its results was Spain, and we showed how intimately the intolerance of Rome, as carried out in that country, was connected with the decay and present prostration of that once potent and flourishing monarchy.

Our next instance of the same result, flowing from the same causes, shall be drawn from the history of France, and though this connection may not at first sight appear so obvious, we do not doubt that a little consideration will satisfy any impartial mind, that the fall of the French monarchy, the expulsion of the Bourbons, and the anarchy and confusion that has existed in that country for the last fifty years, may, in a great measure, be traced to that act of Louis XIV. so applauded at Rome, so startling to Protestant Europe—namely, the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes.

In France, far advanced as she was amongst the nations of Europe in the arts and sciences, the Reformation had originally made great progress. The birth-place of Calvin and of Le Fevre, the reformed doctrines had also found favour with many of the nobles, and had been embraced by the sister of the king, and by several of the princes of the blood. We are not going to recount here the scenes enacted in that country in the 16th century; the horrors of St. Bartholomew; the long civil war which the French Roman Catholics, instigated by the Court of Rome and aided by the Spaniards—the hereditary enemies of the French monarchy—carried on against their lawful sovereign because he was a Protestant, are too well known to need recapitulation here; but we propose to take up the history of French Protestantism at that period when the intestine discords of France were at length healed by the establishment of Henry IV. on the throne, and by the peace which, founded on the Edict of Nantes, secured to the Huguenots the right of worshipping God in the way their consciences allowed them.

That edict was promulgated in the year 1598, and for a period of thirty years that followed it, the Huguenots, instigated by ambitious chiefs, and distrustful, perhaps, of their old enemies, abused its provisions, and laid themselves open to the charge of rebellion and insubordination. In 1629, however, the vigorous measures of Richelieu, and the capture of Rochelle, left the Huguenots without the ability of giving further resistance to the government, and thenceforth, deserted by their former leaders—the Condes, the Turennes, and the Rohans—they devoted themselves entirely to the arts of peace. A recent French author, M. Weiss, who has written their history, says—"Compelled to apply themselves to agriculture, trade and manufactures, they abundantly compensated themselves for the other restraints imposed upon them. The vast plains they possessed in Bearn and the western provinces were covered with rich harvests. In Languedoc, the cantons peopled by them became the best cultivated, and the most fertile, often in spite of the badness of the soil. The skilful vine-dressers of Berri restored its former prosperity to that district. Those of the Pay Messin became the *elite* of the population of more than 25 villages; the gardeners of the same province brought their art to a degree of perfection previously unknown. The Protestants who dwelt in towns devoted themselves to manufactures and trade, and displayed an activity, an intelligence, and, at the same time an integrity which perhaps has never been surpassed in any country. In Gienne they took possession of almost the whole of the wine trade. In Alencon almost all the trade passed through the hands of about 4,000 Protestants. Those of Caen resold to English and Dutch merchants linen and woollen cloths manufactured at Vere, Falaise, and Argentan. The important trade which Metz maintained with Germany was almost entirely in the hands of the Huguenots. It was also to the Protestants that France owed the development of its maritime trade at Bordeaux, La Rochelle, and the Norman ports. In the provinces of Picardy, Champagne, Normandy, the Isle of France, in Touraine, Lyonnais and Languedoc, it was they who created the most important manufactures." Previous to the Revocation of the Edict, we are told by the same author, "France possessed the finest woollen manufactures, and shared with the English, Dutch, and Italians, the rich trade in cloth. At Sedan the manufacture of arms, of implements of husbandry, of scythes, buckles, and, in general, of all kinds of steel and iron articles, had become very considerable. The fine hats of Caudebec found an immense sale in England and Germany. They were manufactured exclusively by Protestant workmen. The beautiful paper manufactures in Auvergne and the Angoumois were also in their hands. It was the Protestants who gave to France the magnificent linen manufactures that so long enriched her north-western provinces. Such was the extent of this manufacture, that in one branch of it alone, the English bought, at Morlaix, every year, 4,500,000 livres' worth, a fact verified by the register of the duties they paid for the stamp on their export from the kingdom. The silk manufactures of Tours and Lyons, so flourishing in the middle of the 17th century, are also said to have owed nearly all their splendour to the